Who owns your scholarship, and who can read it?

Open Access and the future of scholarly publishing

Do you know who owns the copyright to your work? You do, unless you sign away those rights to someone else. As soon as you put pen to paper or fingers to a keyboard, you have created an “original work of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression,” and you own all the rights in that work. You do not need to register with the Copyright Office or even use a copyright notice, such as ©, although both may be recommended in some circumstances. You do not even need to publish the work. Nor does Emory University ordinarily assert copyright ownership to traditional scholarly works by faculty, such as books, articles, plays, musical compositions, and artistic creations, under the Emory IP Policy (policies.emory.edu/7.6).

The author automatically receives a bundle of rights, including the exclusive right to reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute, perform, and display the work publicly. It is this bundle of rights that publishers traditionally require authors to transfer to them in publication agreements.

For at least the past century, publishers have asked for this transfer of copyright because it allows them to fully exploit the work. The past several years, however, have seen growing tensions around copyright and re-use. Scholars and research funders are questioning those traditional
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agreements, and institutions—including Emory—are beginning to provide the means to disseminate faculty work themselves through emerging digital technologies.

Why is this happening now? For decades, commercial publishers have charged inflation rates far above the Consumer Price Index, the effects of which have been exacerbated by the global economic downturn. As more of libraries’ budgets are devoted to ever-increasing journal costs, fewer books are being purchased and therefore published, making it harder for newer faculty in the humanities and social sciences, where book publishing is expected for tenure. And as libraries purchase less content, neither the author (who wants the work distributed), nor the reader (who wants to consume the work), nor the publisher (who wants to profit from the work), nor the university (which wants to fulfill its mission of creating and disseminating knowledge) is well served.

Another reason is increasingly contentious questions about how much educational use is fair use. Georgia State University, for example, is currently being sued by Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, and SAGE Publications for copyright infringement for the use of copyrighted materials in E-Reserves, Blackboard, and faculty web pages. Faculty authors also find themselves paying permissions to publishers to re-use their own published work (with correct citations that they may exploit financially for a period of time. But many faculty authors would say copyright is stifling their creativity. A mitigating approach is to negotiate publication agreements that allow you to re-use your own scholarship in particular ways. It is possible to transfer copyright and also retain some rights for re-use.

Another way of doing so is through a concept called Open Access, which is the reduction of barriers to scholarship made possible by digital distribution. Open Access can increase access and lower copyright and permissions barriers. Open Access can refer to journals, books, and repositories.

For authors, an Open Access journal can provide ways to increase readership and influence. Faculty authors typically publish articles to disseminate their work and build a reputation, not to make a profit. Most Open Access publishers do not require a transfer of copyright.

Many Open Access publishers are also employing Creative Commons licenses (creativecommons.org/), a legal tool that enables an author to retain copyright while allowing certain specified uses of the work, such as giving attribution or prohibiting commercial use. The benefit to authors is that they can set the conditions for re-use of their work without having to answer permissions requests. The benefit to users is the copyright owner’s conditions of re-use are clearly stated. According to the Directory of Open Access Journals, currently 780 Open Access journals use Creative Commons licenses.

For readers, Open Access removes the barrier of subscription costs. And for universities, Open Access can effectively disseminate knowledge. At Emory, we have several Open Access journals that are flourishing (for examples, see the last issue of Academic Exchange at www.emory.edu/ACAD_EXCHANGE/2009/octnov/sidebar.html.) Emory also established an Open Access repository for Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETDs) in June 2007 (etd.library.emory.edu/). Emory has more than 58,000 abstract views and 10,000 downloads from countries on every continent except

MOLECULAR VISION: ONE JOURNAL’S JOURNEY

The costs to authors, readers, and libraries for the publishing process were out of control in 1994-95. Journals were charging authors and subscribers too much for relatively modest services. As authors, scientists were providing the raw material for publishers, yet they were charged for providing this material. As readers and subscribers, scientists provided the market for the product of the publishers, and of course they were charged for access. Scientists were charged largely for access to their own work product. Molecular Vision, with no submission or production fees and no subscription fees, came along and challenged this model, making a lot of publishers very nervous.

Molecular Vision was founded and has remained successful because of the need for a journal in the area of the molecular biology and genetics of the visual system. No other journal in 1994 had an editorial board qualified to peer review the subject area. The journal’s distribution and business model was designed from the outset as web-based (even though browsers had become image- and table-capable only months before), allowing for no-fee participation by anyone. As such, Molecular Vision became the prototypical Open Access journal before there was a formalized Open Access movement at all.

Molecular Vision’s approach also addressed the contemporary problem of slow publishing cycles. It was not uncommon for more than eighteen months to pass between acceptance of a manuscript and publication of the paper in basic vision research journals. The competition provided by Molecular Vision forced publishers to move faster and keep costs lower.

Because the Internet and web permeate our lives today, it is hard to remember a time when this approach was not only new and controversial but also actively attacked by the old guard, even among scientists, who were being charged coming and going by the status quo. Today, Molecular Vision continues to be ranked in the top 13 percent of all scientific journals and among the top three or four of its field, positions it has enjoyed for nearly all of its fifteen years of its existence.

—John Nickerson, Editor, Molecular Vision
Antarctica. This extent of exposure would never have been possible without Open Access.

**Free to read but not free to produce**

Open Access scholarship is free to readers with an Internet connection, but it does cost something to produce. For publishers, the challenge is how to pay for it—or in some cases, how to prevent it from negatively affecting subscription revenues. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy, which became effective April 2008, balances these issues. The NIH Public Access Policy requires articles resulting from NIH grant funding to be deposited in PubMed Central, the NIH’s Open Access archive of biomedical and life sciences journal literature, within twelve months of publication. The policy behind this law is that the public should have access to publicly funded research. A twelve-month embargo period protects publisher subscription revenues.

Open Access publishers don’t have subscription revenues to protect, but they do have costs. Publication fees charged to authors is one mechanism that Open Access publishers use to cover peer review, editing, production, and hosting costs. These fees are often in the thousands of dollars. Many grant funders, including the NIH, allow funds to be used to cover publication fees. Not all authors have grant funding or can afford these fees, however. This is a drawback to the Open Access journal business model of publication fees.

But publication fees are only one income model for Open Access publishing. The Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition has created a guide of Income Models for Supporting Open Access, including advertising, sponsorships, and endowments, among others (www.arl.org/sparc/publisher/incomemodels/).

**The role of the university**

If one of the enduring goals of a university is to create and disseminate knowledge, then what role should the university play in Open Access? Is Open Access in sync with Emory’s mission to be “A destination university internationally recognized as an inquiry-driven, ethically engaged, and diverse community, whose members work collaboratively for positive transformation in the world through courageous leadership in teaching, research, scholarship, health care, and social action?” Can the success of the ETD repository serve as a model?

Currently under exploration at Emory is an online Open Access repository for journal articles authored by faculty. In April 2009, the Library Policy Committee, in partnership with the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence, received approval from the Faculty Council to hold a series of Open Access Conversations with faculty groups on campus. The purpose of these conversations is to get feedback from the Emory community on how an Open Access/Rights Retention Resolution could work for them.

Successful Open Access/Rights Retention Resolutions at other institutions include the following elements:

- limited to journal articles, which faculty typically give away to publishers;
- authors retain copyright but grant a non-exclusive license to the university to distribute in repository;
- a waiver or opt-out clause for instances when faculty member can’t or doesn’t want to deposit;
- an easy mechanism to comply and deposit;
- an embargo period to comply with publisher policies; and
- the policy is monitored and reviewed.

Although the NIH Public Access Policy and requests by authors have made publishers more amenable to distribution of articles through Open Access repositories, not all publishers are willing to have authors distribute their work except through the journal. The Open Access Conversations are ongoing, and we seek feedback through your questions, concerns, and suggestions, either by email or by posting on the Emory Open Access page on the Questions & Responses tab (guides.main.library.emory.edu/OA). And in this issue of the Academic Exchange, several faculty members talk about their own experiences with various forms of Open Access publishing. We hope their ideas will also inform this important conversation on our campus.
Access textbook on Emory’s website?

Q: Why would a faculty member consider putting an Open Access textbook on Emory’s website?

A: I teach a course for which I currently cannot find a satisfactory text. Those in the field that would be acceptable are either too old or too expensive. The only current candidate text costs more than $250, and I can’t see asking public health students (among the poorer of our flock) to spend this kind of money on a one-semester course. I suspect there are faculty teaching courses on this topic at other schools who face the same problem, especially at schools in low-resource settings. In addition, the ability to update material immediately when a truly important insight comes along is very attractive. I’m also willing to give up the rather unrealistic possibility of receiving payment for the work.

Q: Why not just create your own website and place the material there?

A: I think it would be good for users to see Emory’s branding when they look at the site. Also, I don’t have the information technology skills to build or maintain a website.

Q: Would this put Emory out on the fringe of respected universities?

A: In fact, Emory has been rather slow to adopt these efforts. Several US universities I consider to be in the same league as Emory (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Rice University) now not only accept but promote Open Access text publishing. On MIT’s OpenCourseWare site, several books published by MIT Press are available for purchase in printed version and also available for download with no charge. Rice’s Connexions Consortium project (a project of Rice University Press) provides tools for authoring Open Access educational materials of many types, including textbooks. Columbia University Press now offers selected historical works at Gutenberg-e, an Open Access publishing site under specified use rights (in fact, an Emory author is included among those published here). The MERLOT group (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching) listed on their website on February 22, 2010, a total of 427 Open Access texts; several of these are in “wiki” format so they can frequently be updated. The state of California has begun a Free Digital Textbook Initiative to identify digital texts that meet the content standards set by the California Educational System. www.clem.org/fdti/FDTI_Report.pdf

Make Textbooks Affordable—a project of Student PIRG (Public Interest Research Groups) laying out the problem and providing a catalog of available on-line resources. It also includes a petition that faculty interested in this issue can sign. www.studentpirgs.org/textbooks/


Emory University Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Click on link “Search by Year.” When accessed on February 19, 2010, it listed 315 theses from 2009, 113 from 2008, 34 from 2007. https://etd.library.emory.edu/
Not too long ago, checkout clerks at food stores inquired, “Paper or plastic?” A similar question is now being asked about much published scholarship. Except that the choice is now paper or electrons. By electrons, I mean a digital medium, in which the information is developed, produced, and stored entirely on computers—in stark contrast to the volumes of paper journals that lined the shelves of libraries and many professors’ offices. To be fair, most journals that I read are now published in both paper and in electronic formats. This shift marks more than a change of format, however. It is a sea-change—the kind of transformation that the Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter said were caused by “gaels of creative destruction.” In his model, systems change when new ideas, products, and technologies bring about the destruction of the old. The emergence of digital scholarship appears to follow this model: the freely accessible electronic media is replacing the more expensive paper one.

Ecology and Society (www.ecologyandsociety.org) was one of the first entirely digital journals. Many journals that began in print now produce both paper and electronic versions, but Ecology and Society has always lived exclusively in a virtual world. It was developed following a challenge to a handful of graduate students at Carleton University in the mid-1990s. After four years of hard work gathering funds and writing software, the first issue was published (“posted” might be a better word) in 1997. At the time of this writing, the fifteenth issue is underway. For the past seven years, I’ve been co-editor-in-chief of the journal. Over the past decade, it has grown into an internationally recognized, highly rated publication.

An interdisciplinary journal, Ecology and Society focuses on the interactions between people and their environment. Specifically, we publish articles that deal with “the management, stewardship and sustainable use of ecological systems, resources and biological diversity at all levels, and the role natural systems play in social and political systems and conversely, the effect of social, economic and political institutions on ecological systems and services.”

The journal is Open Access, which means that all of its content is available on the Internet. We believe that making such work freely and readily available will contribute to a greater global exchange of knowledge and information. The journal has over 13,000 subscribers in over 100 countries, with most of the subscribers located in North America and Europe. Subscribers pay nothing, but they do register with the journal to receive information such as notices when a new issue is published. The journal publishes about 120 articles per year in two issues. Funding for the journal comes from a combination of sources, including grants, institutional dues, and page charges.

Lessons from the journal

Focus on quality. Early in the planning stages of the journal, the founders set a goal of development of a high quality product. The threshold for Internet publishing is very low; once a few technical obstacles (such as learning how to develop and create a website) are overcome, then everyone can publish anything. Ecology and Society set out to become a credible scientific outlet by selecting a high profile editor-in-chief, asking respected scientists to be members of the editorial board, and implementing a double-blind review process for each manuscript. As a result, more than half of the submitted manuscripts are declined. In the past few years, the journal has ranked among the top half-dozen environmental science and environmental studies journals. Indeed, one of our editors, Elinor Ostrom, won a Nobel Prize in economics in 2009.

Encourage creativity. The journal fosters publications that explore novel ideas and the application of those ideas by awarding annual prizes. A prize of 500 Euro is awarded to the author(s) of the most novel paper that integrates different streams of science to assess fundamental questions in the ecological, political, and social foundations for sustainable social-ecological systems. Another award (1000 Euro) is given annually to the individual or organization that is the most effective in bringing transdisciplinary science into practice. Both of these prizes are donated by a private European foundation.

Stay small and efficient. The journal has become successful because of the hard work of a small group of people. An executive director handles all of the financial and managerial work. A managing editor efficiently handles the flow of manuscript submissions, reviews, editing, and final publication. Custom-designed software was developed for the journal in order to manage the entire production process. The editors-in-chief evaluate each manuscript and oversee the review process that is handled by a network of subject editors and reviewers. The executive director, managing editor, and editors-in-chief coordinate the large task of manuscript review using the custom software.

Develop an open network of scholars. A pleasant surprise that has emerged from the journal has been the creation of a network of thinkers that has formed around it. That is, the scholars who contribute to the journal, the subscribers who use the information, and the small group that facilitates publication all form a network. The first editor suggested that the journal has created a virtual institute—one without walls and with a minimal support infrastructure. This network has helped with the funding of major research centers in Sweden, Australia, England, Canada, and the United States, as well as with the production of dozens of scholarly books and hundreds of publications.

The journal has succeeded in part because it has adhered to traditional notions of a scholarly journal by publishing rigorously vetted and novel articles. Its success can also be attributed to content that addresses both the natural (ecological) science and social science dimensions of an environmental issue. That is, Ecology and Society fills an interdisciplinary niche. The web-based platform of the journal has allowed both for modest expansions in the ways ideas are communicated and for a wide dissemination of those ideas.

While Ecology and Society has become a globally recognized outlet for scholarship, it will change in the future. Following Schumpeter’s model, something new will replace it. It should be interesting to see what the next round of creative destruction brings to scholarship.
During much of 2009, when technical glitches delayed the Spenser Review’s shift from print to electronic access (spenserreview.org/), a version of Sally Field’s infamous Oscar speech often came to mind: “You like us!” The Review was issued in print for several decades, but cost considerations and concerns about longevity led to the decision that it should “go digital.”

The transition took several months longer than expected; accordingly, as editor of the Review, I became overwhelmed by emails from faculty, librarians, and subscription services around the globe who wanted to know what had happened to the Review and when it would reappear on the web. It was both gratifying and remarkable to realize how attached the Spenserian community (largely professors who research and teach the works of the sixteenth-century author of The Faerie Queene) is to this journal of notes, queries, book reviews, announcements, and occasional essays of interest, focused on Shakespeare’s contemporary, Edmund Spenser. Many of those who wrote expressed panicked worry that they had forgotten to renew their subscriptions and thus had not received issues. Others wanted to ensure that they got any copies they might have missed. Authors with material in press asked whether they could reassure their deans that their contributions were, indeed, about to appear. The Spenser Review may not grace coffee tables across the land, but its subscribers and writers clearly appreciate its regular arrival and make their impatience known when it fails to appear on schedule.

However eagerly our audience clamored for our reappearance, however, the Spenser Review’s success as an Open Access, online journal remains uncertain. “Open Access” means free to the public; it does not mean free to produce. Historically, much of the Review’s financing has come from subscribers, with international readers paying a premium to cover overseas postage and the high rate of lost issues among those sent abroad. When the Executive Committee of the International Spenser Society met to discuss the change to electronic publication, many of those present understandably worried that Spenserians would fail to renew their Society memberships once they realized they would no longer receive the print issues offered to members. The change to digital is too recent for us to know whether this fear will come true. If it does, we don’t know what we will do. Emory provides a subsidy to pay for a graduate student assistant and some other production costs, but no institution is likely to cover the entire cost of producing the journal. If members balk at paying for something that they can read online whether or not they subscribe, the Review’s future will be in serious jeopardy. We chose electronic transmission to promote sustainability; it remains to be seen whether that path leads toward our longevity or our demise.

Having directed an Open Access database project since 1994 (the Emory Women Writers Resource Project or EWWRP at womenwriters.library.emory.edu/), I was already familiar with many of the advantages and challenges of producing a freely available scholarly resource. When the EWWRP received a major grant several years ago from the National Endowment for the Humanities, for example, our NEH reviewers emphasized that our proposal succeeded in part because we were not charging subscriber fees and because Emory Library’s Lewis H. Beck Center for Electronic Collections was willing and able to promise the site’s continued availability through future changes in computer technology.

Sheila Cavanagh
Professor of English
What’s Old is New Again
Methodist Review as both scholarly tradition and digital pioneer

methodist Review: A Journal of Wesleyan and Methodist Studies is a peer-reviewed, Open Access electronic academic journal that publishes scholarly articles in all areas and eras of Wesleyan and Methodist studies broadly construed, including biblical, theological, philosophical, historical, social-scientific, biographical, ethical, and practical topics and methodologies. Although the journal has just celebrated its first birthday as an Emory-based venture in Methodist scholarship, we would not be entirely accurate in characterizing Methodist Review as a completely “new” journal. Its digital format and blind peer-review policy are certainly new and very welcome. Methodist Review, however, is partly a successor to and partly a transformation of Quarterly Review, which was published jointly by the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry of The United Methodist Church and The United Methodist Publishing House for a quarter-century, from its founding in 1910 until its discontinuance in 2003. Behind the establishment in 1818 of the Methodist Magazine, a North American Methodist effort to emulate John Wesley’s own Arminian Magazine (begun in 1778), the American serial has continued since that date with only minor interruptions and under various names—The Methodist Magazine, Methodist Review, Methodist Quarterly Review, Religion in Life, Quarterly Review, and now, again, Methodist Review—as United Methodism and its predecessor denominations have sought to provide members, friends, and critics alike with intellectually engaged and theologically seriously reflection and comment on important religious, cultural, social, and political matters. Methodist Review intends to continue and extend that tradition.

Methodist Review is sponsored and financially supported by Candler School of Theology, Emory University; the Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University; the Association of United Methodist Theological Schools; and the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry of The United Methodist Church (GBHEM). The corporate office of The Methodist Review, Inc., the not-for-profit corporation that is the publisher of the journal Methodist Review, is located at GBHEM in Nashville; the Methodist Review editorial office is located at Candler School of Theology in Atlanta. Technical support is provided by the Digital Systems division of the Emory University Libraries, where Methodist Review is hosted.

Those involved in the development of Methodist Review have a deep commitment to the Open Access digital publication of academic research and are convinced that an electronic journal, rather than a print journal, best serves our increasingly global audience.

We have a deep commitment to the Open Access digital publication of academic research and are convinced that an electronic journal, rather than a print journal, best serves our increasingly global audience.

however, Methodist Review is limited (at least initially) to the publication of articles in the English language. Authors receive no compensation for articles published in Methodist Review, but they do retain copyright ownership and all intellectual property rights to their work and are free to enter into separate, additional contractual arrangements for the non-exclusive distribution of the journal’s published version of the work (for example, posting it to an institutional website or publishing it in a book), in whole or in part, on the condition that its initial publication in Methodist Review is clearly acknowledged.

A rigorous, blind peer-review process helps to ensure the academic credibility of Methodist Review. To that end, Methodist Review has assembled a large editorial board of very highly qualified senior scholars, all of whom serve on a voluntary basis, to review and evaluate articles and advise the editors about their suitability for publication in the journal. The editorial board has been constituted so as to create an international community of scholarship and to foster intellectual exchanges and research agendas between and among the diverse denominations and peoples who share a spiritual ancestor in John Wesley. Editorial board members teach and write in the areas of American and Reformation history, pastoral care, theology, Biblical studies, ethics, polity, African theology, worship, philosophy, missiology, Wesley studies, and homiletics. Over half function in universities related to The United Methodist Church (Duke, Boston, Emory, Southern Methodist, Drew) or in United Methodist seminaries. Methodist Review’s board also includes several members from African institutions, one from Germany, one from Russia, two from Latin America, and several from American institutions not
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We’re clearly at a time of transition in the meaning of ‘publication.’

Jonathan Prude

Associate Professor of History, Immediate Past Chair of the Library Policy Committee

The Academic Exchange: Explain how you might use an Open Access repository for scholarship.

Jonathan Prude: Let’s say, for example, I am writing an article due to a journal in a couple of months. Maybe, if that particular journal permitted me, I would put it in the repository and get some comments—pre-publication, pre-peer review. Another model would be that I’ve submitted an article and it’s been accepted, but maybe there’s a two-year lag before publication. So I put it out there—maybe I want to tweak it, maybe not. Maybe I just want it out there. Or maybe the journal would allow me, after it’s in print, to put it in this venue, so that more and different kinds of people would see it.

We’re talking about creating a new kind of space—an electronic opening for people to put article-length pieces of their work out there so that others can respond and the authors can take on new kinds of reactions. It’s a little like walking up and down the hall of this building and dropping off drafts of articles and getting reactions and learning what people think. You’re on an electronic hallway. But of course it’s more than that because this electronic hallway would be university-wide. I think at best there could be the possibility of really new kinds, new levels, new intensities of cross-ventilation and possibly new kinds of cooperation.

AE: How skeptical were you at first?

JP: For some of the same reasons that I think some in the humanities and possibly social sciences are still skeptical, I was initially skeptical when I came on the library policy committee five or six years ago. By the time I became chair, which ended this year, I had become a supporter of moving in this direction.

There were several reasons for my initial concern. One, will this prevent me from publishing in the dominant sovereign journals of my field? I think that is utterly manageable. Different journals are developing different policies, and since participating in the Open Access repository is entirely voluntary, you can opt out. Then I think some people worry

Avice A. Meehan

Vice President for Communication and Public Affairs, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Chevy Chase, Maryland

As of January 2008, the HHMI requires original, peer-reviewed research publications from its researchers to be freely available and downloadable on-line within six months of publication.

The Academic Exchange: Describe the origins of HHMI’s policy regarding public access publishing.

Avice Meehan: The HHMI is a medical research organization engaged in the direct conduct of biomedical research. The scientists are our employees but are based at labs across the country, which makes our approach different than the more traditional mechanism of awarding grants. We want to ensure that our scientists have the freedom and opportunity to submit their original research articles to the journals of their choice. By the same token, we want to ensure that the results of original research are made widely accessible within the scientific community and beyond as quickly as possible. To balance those two goals, we require that all original research papers produced by our scientists appear in a public repository—such as PubMed Central, the National Institutes of Health free digital archive of biomedical and life sciences journal articles—within six months of publication.

AE: What was the impetus for establishing the policy?

AM: Over the years, we’ve established a number of policies that ensure the broad dissemination of research results. We also have policies on sharing research material, reagents and other chemicals, computer programs, and even fruit flies generated in our lab. Our policy on public access for publications is an extension of that.

“"We want to ensure that the results of original research are made widely accessible within the scientific community and beyond as quickly as possible.”

AE: Were there substantial hurdles to putting the policy in place?

AM: Not really. Tom Cech, who was the president of the institute at the time, could have just declared the policy. But he felt it was important to engage in a broad consultative process, in part because although we have many HHMI investigators who are enthusiastic proponents of the Open Access publishing model, and some who are leaders of the movement, we also have investigators who have a different perspective. They may be involved in the editorial boards of journals published by smaller societies or institutes. The type of changes that are rippling through the world of scientific publishing can be quite challenging to the viability of those smaller journals.

AE: How does the policy for public access accommodate the policies of the numerous journals to which HHMI scientists submit their work?

AM: The HHMI has a database that spells out the policies for each journal and also explains the responsibilities of our scientists. Some journals will upload a paper [to PubMed Central] automatically, but others require researchers to do that.

AE: How many papers have been affected by the policy?
that someone might appropriate their insights and weave them into their work and not give credit. And there’s likewise the problem of whether to assess work posted in the repository for tenure and promotion. Again, I think a solution can be found.

But I think there’s also another concern in play—and it relates to the heightened cooperation I just mentioned. If my work is embedded in newly dense interactions between myself and my Emory colleagues, then the line between what I’ve done and a more collaborative enterprise is growing softer. Scientists are more used to this way of working than we humanists. Indeed, I think we tend to view it as a loss of autonomy, as threatening. I myself have felt this way. And even now I’ve by no means surrendered a desire to be the author of the book I’m working on. Questioning that individual-creator mindset can feel like devaluing what we’ve understood it means to be a humanist scholar. But here, too, I’ve come to feel the problem is not overwhelming. The anxiety that humanist scholars may feel about losing autonomy will take time to resolve. But there’s at least the potential for marvelous new shared creativities.

AE: What about the idea of having multiple versions of work publicly available?

JP: The professional and intellectual costs are minimal—inconvenient, confusing in the short run—but so was the telephone. In the long run, it might well change how we think of finality in a piece of scholarship. And that’s troubling but also kind of interesting and exciting. You have different folio editions of the Bard. You have work that’s continuing to unfold.

AE: So you were persuaded not so much by the problem of an unsustainable economic model, but by a new way of working?

JP: It’s a doorway to a new way of doing knowledge. But it is surely tied to economics. As a member of a university community, I’m very concerned about the skyrocketing cost of books and especially of serials confronting research libraries. At its best, a university library, whether conceived as buildings or databases, is a switching point, a venue of utterly unpredictable percolation, that permits magical things to happen. I imagine an Open Access repository to be part of that percolating—and in that sense, yes, part of the conversation universities are starting to have with publishers.

But the repository also has implications for the relationship between authors and publishers. We’re clearly at a time of transition in the meaning of ”publication.” It’s been a marvelous revelation to me that people in my field—history—at the point of writing something down, automatically possess copyright. We actively, but unthinkingly, grant it to a publisher. As a historian, I will say that practice of granting copyright was likely implemented at a certain moment for certain reasons in the nineteenth century. And now it can be unimplemented. We need to take back that right—or at least surrender it more thoughtfully. That kind of education about what it means to be an author in the twenty-first century is woven into the repository project. And this is another kind of extraordinary possibility offered by this venture.

AM: Our fairly rough data covering January 2008 through December 2009 shows that more than 1,600 articles had been indexed in PubMed Central, with full text available for more than half of them. When the policy went into effect (in January 2008), we had 300 to 330 scientists, so that’s substantial activity.

AE: You took part in a panel discussion at the 2009 Berlin 7 Open Access Conference that convened in Paris a few months ago. What did you talk about?

AM: We were providing a broad look at the landscape of Open Access in the U.S. I focused on the perspective of a funder, because we’re the single largest non-governmental funder of biomedical research in the U.S. We support almost four hundred researchers who are within the top ranks of science and a cadre of scientists who have played major leadership roles in the Open Access movement. The HHMI continues to have conversations with Open Access advocates and also publishers, and continues to assess the effectiveness of our policy.

AE: What do you anticipate for Open Access publishing in the near future?

AM: It’s hard to tell. As an organization involved in medical research, we’re very focused on our part of the publishing universe. But there are substantial efforts at the federal level to widen public-access policies beyond the biomedical sciences. The Obama administration is currently undertaking a major comment period to look at extending Open Access and public access for research done by the National Science Foundation and other funding agencies. The NIH has a policy in place saying that all NIH-funded research must be made accessible through PubMed Central within one year. No such policies exist for research funded by other agencies within the federal government.

Scholarly publishing is in a state of great flux. The humanities and other areas of scholarly thought that aren’t as well funded face substantial challenges. There are still costs associated with journal publication, even if you go to an all-electronic format. You still need an editorial staff; you still have to orchestrate peer review as well as editing. There are big debates as to how this will be managed.
Spenser Goes Digital
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Such grants are not easy to acquire, however, and the EWWRP has been fortunate to receive support that helps off-set its lack of viewer funding. Although Google analytics tools indicate that the site is entered regularly by large numbers of scholars and students from around the world, none of those visitors pay us anything. We remain successful, therefore, but financial stability is never presumed.

The Review will face similar obstacles as it continues through its digital life. Already, the transition has both saved us money and cost us more than initially determined. In our early discussions with Emory, for instance, there was no talk of paying the university to host the electronic journal. By the time we made the move, the implied “free ride” was no longer available. Emory, of course, will also incur costs, which are now being passed along to us. Like the EWWRP, which needs to be migrated to new systems as technology changes, the Review will rely upon Emory to ensure that back issues remain accessible when electronic platforms evolve. Our initial decision not to charge a subscriber fee resulted from Emory’s insistence that we provide Open Access. Realistically, however, the cost of monitoring passwords, subscriptions, and other aspects of fee-based services would have eliminated the money saved by reducing printing and mailing costs. At the moment, we can’t afford subscribers. Unfortunately, the template we now use often confuses readers because it appears to demand a password. We are hopeful that this idiosyncrasy is temporary. Now that we are no longer a print-based journal, the Review encounters a range of interesting and perplexing questions. The software we use is comparatively user-friendly, but the Review cannot survive without a graduate student assistant and a team of volunteers who are willing to contend with technology. Subject knowledge alone, at least in the case of the Spenser Review, cannot produce this brand of scholarly product.

I have been fortunate to have a number of Emory graduate students and staff, including Erika Farr, Alice Hickcox, Gitanjali Shahani and Irene Middleton, work and/or advise on both the EWWRP and the Spenser Review. These lengthy collaborations have made both projects possible. Without the Beck Center, then under the direction of Chuck Spornick, the EWWRP would never have gotten off the ground and it is highly unlikely that I would have accepted the editorship of the Review when I was asked to take it on several years ago. More recent participants, like Katie Doubler, the current graduate assistant, bring the advantage of a fresh perspective, introducing pertinent issues, such as how closely we want to model the electronic Review on its print predecessor. We no longer have the limits on article length that our print budget imposed, for instance, and we need not be bound by the same publication schedule. We could, for example, add content as it is received, rather than continuing to publish discrete issues, although we have no immediate plans to do so. Years of close working relationships with Emory librarians have prepared me for the dilemmas likely to arise from those needing to catalogue a journal that has moved from print to digital. Still, additional, unforeseen complications will inevitably appear through this transition to a new medium. Emory has been working on a business partnership that would allow individual readers to purchase a low-cost print copy annually, but this relationship is not yet cemented, much to the consternation of some long-term subscribers. Digital publication continues to move into uncharted territory, and projects like the Review and the EWWRP can anticipate continual new challenges.

As Emory moves toward creating and standardizing policies for electronic publication undertaken by its faculty, staff, and students, numerous questions will emerge, revolving around intellectual property and ownership, copyright, logistical support, and financial implications. What happens to a digital product, for instance, when an initiator leaves the university or moves on to other interests? Over its lengthy history, the Review has traveled to a number of host institutions and our digital agreement with Emory discusses this contingency, so that the journal’s electronic nature will not jeopardize its survival in this way. In contrast, the EWWRP was established before faculty members and universities paid much attention to such issues, so its future status is less formalized. Currently, Emory is actively expanding its digital resources through such forthcoming initiatives as the Digital Certificate Program in the ILA and the Digital Scholarly Commons (DiSC) in the Emory Library. Digital work, whether Open Access or not, requires new paradigms that many in the scholarly community have not yet considered. The Review’s apparent popularity will not guarantee its longevity, but Emory’s active engagement with the questions accompanying such products will make its continued success more likely.

---

THE AEWEEKLY TO BECOME THOUGHTWORK IN FALL 2010

For a decade, the AEWekely, an electronic newsletter supplementing the Academic Exchange, has provided bios on new faculty, short reviews of new books by Emory authors, a featured “website of the week,” information on faculty resources, and a useful calendar of intellectual events happening on our campus.

In the fall, the AEWekely will become ThoughtWork: Emerging knowledge and news in Emory University’s intellectual community: Its contents will include:

- Useful and important resources for faculty
- New faculty profiles
- Events calendar

**If you already subscribe to the AEWekely, you will automatically receive ThoughtWork. If you would like to subscribe, please**

Send an email to LISTSERV@listserv.emory.edu

In the text of the email, write SUBSCRIBE AEWEEKLY [your first name] [your last name]

For example, SUBSCRIBE AEWEEKLY John Smith

www.emory.edu/acad_exchange
What’s Old is New Again continued from page 7

related to the UMC. Eight of the twenty-five members of the current editorial board are persons of color, and ten are women.

Since beginning publication on 1 May 2009, Methodist Review has garnered 1,280 subscribers from across the world, representing a significant portion of global Methodism’s academic cohort. We have published six issues (125 pages total). Submissions have been of high quality, and the peer-review system worked better than we could have dreamed, with strong essays getting hard-hitting critical attention and promising very fine resubmissions going forward. And we trust that younger scholars can now publish in Methodist Review and not suffer in the tenure and promotion process (in the past, careers have been hurt—or at least have not advanced—as a consequence of publishing in Methodist serials that were not peer reviewed and thus not considered legitimate scholarly publications). One worry that we do have is the Methodist Review’s quality and peer-review policy may undercut or marginalize other journals that deal with Methodist and Wesleyan topics.

Russell Richey and Ted A. Campbell of Southern Methodist University serve as the co-general editors and Rex Matthews serves as the managing editor of Methodist Review.

Open Access Textbooks continued from page 4

Digital text publishing itself is not the question. Student groups are organizing to promote affordable textbooks. The Amazon Kindle, Apple iPad, and other tablets are sparking a revolutionary demand for digital products, including texts. Drafting, proofing, and publishing a text and its revisions in digital form will be the standard in comparison to the traditional publishing process. Also, fewer trees will be cut to support the process. Most of the established text publishers are adapting to this change. The question is whether Emory will be a player or just sit on the sidelines watching.

Q: MIT faculty own the copyrights to the content they create for OpenCourseWare, but they then license MIT to distribute it. What incentive exists for faculty to enter into such a licensing agreement?

A: The digital world of scholarship now has been welcomed (or at least accepted) at Emory with the development of web-based and Open Access journals, targeted academic programs, and attention to Open Access for theses, dissertations, and other Emory products (please see this and the last issue of Academic Exchange and the last issue of Emory Magazine). What MIT and Rice have that Emory does not have is a systematic and campus-supported approach to digital publishing. Emory’s resources, if applied to this end, would allow the faculty text author to capitalize on Emory’s information technology platforms for widespread dissemination, Emory’s experts in digital communication and editing, and Emory’s resources for dealing with intellectual property issues. Many faculty members do not have expertise in these areas.

Q: Information technology is not cheap, and neither is the time of those who understand this tool. Won’t support for open textbooks waste increasingly precious Information Technology resources that could be used to generate income?

A: To me, this is exactly how Emory Information Technology should be investing its resources. Increasingly, as they decide whether to come to our school, students, faculty peers, and researchers are evaluating our online presence. Promoting every product from our faculty is critical to catch up in this marketing and selection process. This includes textbooks, presentations, blogs, wikis, and just plain storytelling about the great things we do.

Q: Another possible administrative objection is that of risk related to “managing content.” Might a faculty-authored text on Emory’s website open the university to liability problems of copyright infringement; questions of permissions in photographs, tables, and other ancillary materials; and dealing with other contributors who may consider themselves coauthors?

A: As of February 19, 2010, the university has published online more than 450 student theses as “a joint initiative launched by the Emory University Libraries, the Emory Graduate School, and Emory College.” The library also hosts electronic journals that are published by different groups on campus. The university accepts the “managing content” risks associated with these publications. It would be strange for Emory to suggest that the same risk associated with faculty texts should somehow be unmanageable.

Q: Most in the scholarly community still consider only the traditional deliverables like printed journals and textbooks the gold standard for academic achievement. Might projects like yours be a waste of time for junior faculty looking for promotion and tenure?

A: A very valid point for the Emory of today. However, the ivory tower eventually must catch up to the world around us. Selected digital or Open Access journals now are considered in some departments to be of acceptable quality when publications are evaluated. Emory faculty members even edit such journals. As younger faculty replace those who steadfastly stick to the old ways, it should become irrelevant whether a journal article or book is in printed or digital form, and whether the source is restricted or Open Access. Universities like MIT and Cal Tech that actively sponsor Open Access publications have been able to work out appropriate evaluation for scholarship regardless of this aspect.

Q: What’s the next step?

A: My conversations with Emory administrators and staff lead me to believe that they would be willing to explore this further if there were a critical mass of faculty interested in such an effort. What the critical number would be has not been stated, but clearly it is more than one! I would be delighted if other faculty interested in pursuing this would contact me, so we could see there is enough demand to attract administrative attention.
Endnotes

Leapfrogging

Mitra Kalita
Deputy Global Economics Editor, Wall Street Journal, from her comments during the panel discussion, “A Media Empire in India: Learning from America,” part of the Emerging India Summit, March 26, 2010

We talk a lot about leapfrogging, when a family doesn’t have a phone and they skip the land line and get a mobile. This happens a lot in people’s careers as well, especially with the talent crunch in India, and you have young people who become managers for the first time. In many ways, I feel my stint in India leapfrogged my own career. For all of my going over to India to impart the Western way of doing things, I feel that what I took away much more was what America can learn from the Indian media. It really forced me to re-examine U.S. journalism that I had learned. In New Delhi, I received nine newspapers every morning. When I worked at the Washington Post I only received the Washington Post. I didn’t pay attention to other media, even though there were competing newspapers around, and there were also competing websites. In U.S. journalism, as I left in 2006, we were all talking about the shrinking media and smaller news holes and our dying industry. Yes, it was a real honor to launch a newspaper in India, but in many ways I realized that our industry wasn’t dying, that we should have been paying attention to all of those websites, that the listservs that I was on in Washington, D.C., were actually serving our readers and our communities in more relevant ways than perhaps I had done as a local reporter at the Post.

Global nations and global terrorists

Philip Bobbitt
Distinguished Senior Lecturer, University of Texas at Austin School of Law, and leading constitutional scholar, from his talk, “The Future of the Wars on Terror,” February 11, 2010

My friends in Europe think we have some pretty screwy ideas about terrorism. They say, “We know terrorism, you don’t, and the way you have reacted after 9/11 is typical of a society that is panicked, spooked by something unfamiliar. We know how to cope with terror, and it’s not with your defense department, it’s with law enforcement agencies.” I have a lot of friends who are in the military. Many of these people know warfare, and they have some ideas about victory, and they say, “How do you win a war against terror? It would be hard enough to win a war against terrorists . . . but are they all going to surrender? If you go beyond terrorism to terror, who’s going to surrender then? Are you afraid of the dentist, are you afraid of flying, or are you afraid of elevators, or your older sister? It sounds like a public relations slogan, like a who’s going to surrender then? Are you afraid of elevators, or your older sister? It sounds like a public relations slogan, like a war on poverty, or a war on drugs.” Looking at the problem from the vantage point of what we truly know and understand about terrorism, about war, about victory, we will cripplle ourselves. And unless we have new ideas that are more sensitive to changes underway in the international system, in warfare, and in terrorism, we will not be able to cope with the threats that we can already see on the horizon. It might be that most of the ideas we hold now are wrong.

Music and mental illness

Richard Kogan

[Robert] Schumann’s depressions were often accompanied by auditory hallucinations, which either took the form of voices accusing him of being a worthless composer, or he would get some kind of cacophony that would get stuck in his head, and he couldn’t dislodge these unwanted sounds. Schumann, probably more than any composer of his time, believed that the only reason to write music was to give a little internal glimpse of the composer’s inner self. His contemporaries were focusing on form . . . but Schumann had disdain for form. He was really just trying to capture feeling states. He was writing pieces with titles like “Rapture,” “Feverish Dreams,” “First Sorrow.” This is his essence. He was self-taught as a composer. It’s kind of hard to point to any predecessors stylistically. Of just about everybody that consensus puts in the pantheon of great composers, I don’t think anybody was less appreciated during his lifetime . . . He had what we now call bipolar disorder, a manic-depressive illness. But there was no language for that in the nineteenth century. I think during this period, that started with the Romantic era, you had to be somewhat mentally ill to be taken seriously as an artist. But he was probably a couple of standard deviations beyond that.